

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addiese: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
10/541,844	01/06/2006	Bum-Gyu Choi	29137.074.00	8704	
30827 MCKENNA I	7590 06/24/2008 ONG & ALDRIDGE LLP		EXAMINER		
1900 K STREET, NW			CAMERON, ERMA C		
WASHINGTO	DN, DC 20006		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
			1792		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			06/24/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Application No.

Applicant(s) 10/541,844 CHOI ET AL.

Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	/Erma Cameron/	1792					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply							
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D. Eletrosions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period very considered to the control of the provision of the control of the contr	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this o D (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status							
1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro		e merits is				
Disposition of Claims							
4) \(\text{Claim(s)} \frac{1.9}{2} \] is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) \(\text{Claim(s)} \frac{1.9}{2} \] is/are allowed. 6) \(\text{Claim(s)} \frac{1.9}{2} \] is/are rejected. 7) \(\text{Claim(s)} \frac{1.9}{2} \] is/are objected to. 8) \(\text{Claim(s)} \frac{1.9}{2} \] is/are object to restriction and/or							
Application Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) according a constant of the series of the ser	epted or b) objected to by the l drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 C					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati ity documents have been receive I (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National	Stage				
Attachment(s)							
1) Milotice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 40 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 50 Noti	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D: 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate					

- Other: ___

Application/Control Number: 10/541,844 Page 2

Art Unit: 1792

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 - The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
- a) Claim 1: it is not clear what is meant by "under a base catalyst".
- b) Claim 3: it appears that "oligomers...Formula I" has been repeated in this claim.
- c) Claim 3 and 4: it is not clear if C1-4 is "C1-4" or "C1~4". In addition, the meaning of C1~4 is unclear. How can the number of carbon atoms be approximate?
- d) Claim 6: it is not clear if the organic solvent of c) is the same or different from the organic solvent of b).
- e) Claim 7: "organic molecules", "organic polymers", and organic dendrimers" overlap and the claim is therefore unclear as to its limitations

Application/Control Number: 10/541,844 Page 3

Art Unit: 1792

f) Claims 3 and 4: the meaning of "independently" is not entirely clear. For the purposes of

examination, the examiner considers the term to mean that more than one type of R1, R2, R3,

R4, R5, R6, R7 and R8 may coexist on one molecule. If this is not a correct assumption, the

applicant should so state.

g) Claim 9: lacks a period.

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Most references to a catalyst in the specification make it clear that a basic catalyst should be used (4:3-16: 5:14-18: 8:12-9:17).

However, 12:17-24 states that either an acid or base catalyst may be used. This appears to contradict all other statements regarding the catalyst.

The applicant is requested to clarify.

5. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Claim 6 lacks the required base catalyst, as described in the specification. There is no evidence that the claimed invention will be operational without the base catalyst.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

 The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- Claims 1-2 and 5-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Nishikawa et al (US2001/0055892).

'892 teaches formation of an insulating film on a semiconductor device by hydrolyzing and condensing a silane of formula 1 to 3 and formula 4. In formula 1, R may be H, thus being a hydrosilane. Water and organic solvent are present. A base catalyst like ammonia is also present. After application to a substrate, the coating is dried and cured. [0006]-[0015] [0046] [0129]-[0130]

Application/Control Number: 10/541,844 Page 5

Art Unit: 1792

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8 The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the

manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 3-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishikawa et

al (US2001/0055892).

'892 is applied here for the reasons given above.

In formula 1 of '892, when R=H and a=1, formula 1 meets the limitations of Formula 1

of claim 3.

10

The compounds of claim 4 are not required, as "other than hydrosilane compounds" is

not a requirement of claim 2. However, formula 2 of '892 meets the limitations of formula 3 of

claim 4 where p=0 and R4 is alkxoy.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to /Erma Cameron/ whose telephone number is 571-272-1416. The

examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-6:00, alternate Fridays off.

Application/Control Number: 10/541,844 Page 6

Art Unit: 1792

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Timothy Meeks can be reached on 571-272-1423. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Erma Cameron/ Primary Examiner Art Unit 1792

June 20, 2008